

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed February 25, 2005, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1, 2, and 4 through 18 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, and 4 through 18 stand rejected. Claim 3 was previously canceled. Applicants propose to amend claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6, 8-11, 15, 17 and 18 and cancel claims 7 and 16, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as proposed to be amended herein.

Entry of the above amendment to the specification, which updates Government Rights in the present Application, is respectfully solicited.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. The Office Action states that “it is unclear how the processing chamber at lines 1-2 of claim 5 and claim 6 related to the processing chamber at line 3 of claim 5 and claim 6.” (Office Action at page 9). Although Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, claims 5 and 6 are proposed to be amended herein to clarify the relationship. It is requested this rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910 to Argyle et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919 to Beck

Claims 1, 2, 4 through 13, and 15 through 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Argyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910) in view of Beck (U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919). Claims 7 and 16 has been canceled, rendering the rejection thereof moot.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. **Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on

applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

As proposed to be amended, claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*, "an entry seal in communication with the processing chamber, the entry seal comprising at least one baffle having a non-equidimensional aperture of non-linear and non-rectangular shape therethrough to accept an elongated substrate of substantially matching, but slightly larger, cross-section."

Proposed amended claim 1 thus contains element not taught or suggested in the applied references, alone or in combination. Claims 2, 4 through 13, 15 and 17 through 18 depend from claim 1 and similarly contain these elements. Further, Applicants note that the limitations of claims 4-6, 15, 17 and 18 as proposed to be amended herein, when read in combination with those of claim 1, are each further allowable as distinguishing over the references as applied. Accordingly, it is requested that the amendment be entered and these claims allowed.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910 to Argyle et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919 to Beck and U.S. Patent No. 2,545,576 to Godley

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Argyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,709,910) in view of Beck (U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919) and Godley (U.S. Patent No. 2,545,576). The Office Action states that "Argyle et al and Beck are applied for the reasons noted above." (Office Action at page 6). Proposed amended claim 1 contains elements not taught or suggested in Argyle et al. or Beck. Claim 14 similarly contains these elements, which are not taught or suggested in Godley. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 3,650,042 to Boerger et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919 to Beck

Claims 1, 4 through 6, 8 through 11, and 15 through 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boerger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,650,042) in view of Beck (U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919). Claims 7 and 16 have been canceled, rendering the rejection thereof moot. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as proposed to be amended, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the combination suggested in the Office Action.

As noted above, claim 1 as proposed to be amended now recites, *inter alia*, “an entry seal in communication with the processing chamber, the entry seal comprising at least one baffle having a non-equidimensional aperture of non-linear and non-rectangular shape therethrough to accept an elongated substrate of substantially matching, but slightly larger, cross-section.” Applicants also note that claim 1 has been amended to recite the presence, in the claimed system, of “the processing chamber being configured to initiate a pressure drop in the treatment mixture such that the modifying composition is released from the carrier medium and applied to the elongated substrate within the processing chamber,” such structure being untaught and unsuggested by the combination of Boerger et al. and Beck.

Proposed amended claim 1 thus contains element not taught or suggested in the Boerger et al. or Beck references. Claims 2, 4 through 6, 8 through 11, 15, and 17 through 18 depend from claim 1 and similarly contain these elements. Further, Applicants note that the limitations of claims 4-6, 15, 17 and 18 as proposed to be amended herein, when read in combination with those of claim 1, are each further allowable as distinguishing over the references as applied. Accordingly, it is requested that the amendment be entered and these claims allowed

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 3,650,042 to Boerger et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919 to Beck and U.S. Patent No. 2,545,576 to Godley

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boerger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,650,042) in view of Beck (U.S. Patent No. 3,618,919) and Godley (U.S. Patent No. 2,545,576). The Office Action states that “Boerger et al and Beck are applied for the reasons noted above.” (Office Action at page 8). Proposed amended claim 1 contains elements not taught or suggested in Boerger et al. or Beck. Claim 14 similarly contains these elements, which are not taught or suggested in Godley. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The proposed amendments to the claims should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search. Finally, if the Examiner determines that the amendments do not place the application in

condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested upon filing of a Notice of Appeal herein.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Office determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Christian
Registration No. 32,687
Attorney for Applicants
P.O. Box 1625
Idaho Falls, ID 83415-3899
Phone: (208) 526-9140
Fax: (208) 526-8339

Date: 19 APR 2005